## Exhibit B

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	x UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
3	18 CR 204(NGG) versus
4	KEITH RANIERE, et al, United States Courthouse
5	Brooklyn, New York
6	April 4, 2019 Defendants. 11:00 a. m.
7	x
8	TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR STATUS CONFERENCE
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE NICHOLAS GARAUFIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10	APPEARANCES
11	For the Government: RICHARD DONOGHUE
12	United States Attorney Eastern District of New York
13	271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201
14	BY: MOIRA KIM PENZA, AUSA TANYA HAJJAR, AUSA
15	MARK LESKO, AUSA
16	For K. Raniere: BRAFMAN & ASSOCIATES
17	767 Third Avenue, 26th Floor New York, New York 10017
	BY: MARC AGNIFILO, ESQ.
18	TENY GERAGOS, ESQ.
19	DEROHANNESIAN & DEROHANNESIAN 677 Broadway, Suite 707
20	Albany, New York 12207 BY: PAUL DEROHANNESIAN, II, ESQ.
21	DANIELLE SMITH, ESQ.
22	For C. Bronfman: GERAGOS & GERAGOS Historic Engine Company No. 28
23	644 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, California 90071
24	BY: MARK GERAGOS, ESQ.
25	

```
1
                          CONTINUED APPEARANCES
 2
     For C. Bronfman:
                           HAFETZ & NECHELES, LLP
                            10 East 40th Street, 48th Floor
 3
                            New York, New York 10016
                            BY: KATHLEEN CASSIDY, ESQ.
 4
     For A. Mack:
                            KOBRE & KIM, LLP
 5
                            800 Third Avenue
                            New York, New York 10022
 6
                            BY: SEAN BUCKLEY, ESQ.
 7
     For K. Russell:
                            SHER TREMONTE, LLP
                            90 Broad Street, 23rd Floor
 8
                            New York, New York 10004
                            BY: JUSTINE HARRIS, ESQ.
 9
                                 AMANDA RAVICH, ESQ.
10
11
12
1.3
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
     Reported by:
22
     LISA SCHMID, CCR, RMR
     OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
23
     225 Cadman Plaza East, Room N377
     Brooklyn, New York 11201
24
     Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript
25
     produced by computer-aided transcription.
```

1 MR. GERAGOS: The 17th works for us. 2 THE COURT: Okay. That's on the in limine motions. 3 What else do we have? 4 MR. AGNIFILO: We have a technical issue that I'll 5 let the Government raise about some discovery that they 6 provided, that we -- that we found and then have to give back, 7 but I'll let the Government brief that one to the Court. 8 MS. PENZA: So Your Honor, as you are aware, we had 9 had an issue regarding one of the discovery devices. When we 10 had initially produced the device, we did not know that there 11 were child pornography images on the device. We retracted all 12 of those. They -- we then -- there was --1.3 THE COURT: Were there images in connection with 14 this case on the device? 15 MS. PENZA: Yes, Your Honor. 16 We then -- we then reproduced the device. 17 eliminate the folder that had the child pornography; however, 18 there were additional carved deleted files of that -- those 19 same images, I believe the same ones, in other locations on 20 the drive. 21 The FBI is working right now to create a new version 2.2. of the drive that has removed those deleted images, which we 23 will provide hopefully today to the defendants and receive from them back the original drives that we had. So it's the 24 25 second drive that we had given them.

The Government does want to raise the issue that we put in our -- in our response to the defendant's motion. particular, there have now been two assertions by defense counsel regarding their ability to prepare on the predicate acts related to child pornography. THE COURT: MS. PENZA: And so, the Government is obviously concerned by those representations. I understand that this drive is something that they want to provide to their expert. And so given that, we -- that concern is again raised, that they may need additional time to prepare their expert for those additional charges. THE COURT: T see. MS. PENZA: And so we want to make sure that we are proceeding to trial with the defendant and his counsel saying that they are, indeed, prepared to go forward on April 29th, contrary to what they had put in two previous motions. THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from Mr. Agnifilo. MR. AGNIFILO: Yes, Judge. I don't think we ever said that we couldn't be ready. I think the phrase I used is we were going to move heaven and earth to be ready and we're still going to move heaven and earth to be ready.

We have a very productive dialogue with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

Government around these matters. I think what the Government produced and then needed back was through mere inadvertence, and we caught it. We saw there was something on the drive that should not be in the public sphere.

We contacted the Government. We said, we have to give this back to you. We knew that would end up in some sort of a delay in getting the drive, which is an important piece of evidence in terms of these charges that were recently indicted.

And here's my request -- and I think the Government will work with us on this because they have been working with us on this -- to the extent that we can front-load whatever reports there might exist that relate to the alleged child pornography charges, that -- getting that that sooner rather than later would be very helpful to us.

And so we do have an expert. The expert's been down to the FBI. The Government was very responsive when I asked for dates. They accommodated our dates. Our expert went down. I expect they'll accommodate our other dates.

So as long as we're continuing to be as productive as we've been -- and I think that will continue -- I fully expect to be ready for those charges and all the charges on the trial date.

So, it's a lot of work. It's a lot of work being done at the last minute, but this is what happens in trials

1.3

2.2.

and that's what happening here. And the Government's been 1 2 accommodating and responsive, and I'm sure we can get it done. 3 MS. PENZA: Your Honor, if I may, frankly, that 4 doesn't -- that doesn't satisfy the Government. It doesn't 5 sound like they're in a place to say right now. 6 And in terms of front-loading the information 7 regarding child pornography, Mr. Agnifilo knows that the 8 alleged victim of the child pornography charges goes throughout this case. I mean, there will be almost -- there's 9 10 very little evidence in this case that does not relate to that 11 victim. 12 And so, the Government is going to abide by the 1.3 Court's deadline. We're going to produce everything. 14 given that, the Government is concerned that we are not 15 hearing a clear statement from Mr. Agnifilo and Mr. Raniere, 16 frankly, that they are ready to go. 17 And given that -- we understand that there are 18 jurors coming in. We do understand that the landscape of this 19 case has changed dramatically, and may continue to change over 20 the coming days. 21 If that is the case, the Government does not 2.2. anticipate that our trial will last as long as we have

If that is the case, the Government does not anticipate that our trial will last as long as we have previously said to the Court, because we don't believe there will be -- there won't be six defense attorneys cross-examining witnesses, for example.

23

24

And so given that, the Government, you know, the Government feels that there has not been a representation that they will be ready on April 29th, and the Government believes that it's important to have certainty right now.

THE COURT: Well, let me cut to the chase on this.

You know, while the Court is reserving judgment for the moment on the pending motions to dismiss and sever, I agree.

The Court -- the Court needs to know the answer to the following questions. And this is from each of the four defendants: Are you prepared for trial? Pardon me. Will you be prepared for trial on the second superseding indictment on April 29th, and if not, how much more time do you need to be fully prepared for trial?

I think that's a really essential consideration for the Court. The Court wants to honor its objective of going to trial April 29th, but not -- but not if I do not hear a declaration, in effect, from each of the defendants' counsel, on behalf of the defendants, that they're going to be prepared to go to trial on April 29th.

So, of course, we'll start with you, Mr. Agnifilo, because I agree with the Government, to the degree that there needs to be an affirmative statement that based on what's in the second superseding indictment, that you -- which is a recent indictment -- that you will still be ready to go to trial.

1.3

2.2.

MR. AGNIFILO: I'll be ready to go to trial, and I mean, and I say that because I do need help from the Government. They have been giving me that help. I'm going to need to have my expert going to the FBI. They have been accommodating of that. This little wrinkle with having to give the drive back is not perfectly timed, but we can get through that. I'm told that I'm going to get a new drive soon. Maybe today. That would be wonderful. But I'm going to make it work. I mean, I have an expert on retainer. He's working for us. He's given me an assurance that in his opinion, that he has been doing this for decades, he can get the work done that I need done by the 29th. So I expect to be ready for trial. My request -- and maybe I wasn't as clear as I could have been. I know who the person is in the photographs. That's not the point. I just believe that there's going to be some sort of FBI reports in regard to that part of the FBI investigation regarding the photographs, that if we could get sooner rather than later, that would be helpful to me, but I will be ready to go, representing Mr. Raniere on the Court's trial date. THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Geragos? MR. GERAGOS: Thank you, Your Honor. We will be ready to go on the 29th.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

1 THE COURT: All right. 2 MS. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. 3 You know in our March 22nd letter to the Court, we 4 indicated in connection with our renewal of our motion to 5 sever, enjoining the motion to sever Ms. Bronfman, that we did 6 advise that we were in plea negotiations with the Government, 7 and that the Government had indicated that given the pressure 8 of trial preparation and the fairly abbreviated schedule that 9 we have been on, that additional time would be beneficial to 10 conclude those negotiations. 11 And we'll say, given the Court's denial of the 12 motions that were made by counsel for Ms. Mack for an actual 1.3 adjournment of the trial date, I think substantial progress 14 has been made. 15 So I think that the Government's in a better 16 position to speak to, you know, that particular issue than --17 we have, of course, been preparing for trial, but that's the 18 only aspect of this that bears as to Ms. Russell. 19 THE COURT: Yes? 20 MR. BUCKLEY: Yes, Your Honor. Sean Buckley on 21 behalf of Ms. Mack. 2.2. THE COURT: Yes. 23 MR. BUCKLEY: As the Court is aware, we are the ones 24 who did file a motion for the continuance, and we recognize 25 that Your Honor has denied it. Our motion was to permit us to engage in what have been and what continue to be fruitful discussions regarding potential resolution of this.

But other than that, we are similarly situated to Ms. Harris and her client.

THE COURT: Well, as to Ms. Russel and Ms. Mack, it's the old story. You need to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time in this business.

And we have one defendant who's incarcerated, and so I look very carefully at that kind of request, and I also look at the difficulty of impaneling a jury, since we have already sent notices to 500 potential jurors that I'm going to be interviewing in mid-April, and if I interview them in mid-April and tell them that they're going to have to come to court and try a case in June and July, we're in a much different posture than we would be if we're telling the potential jurors that we're going to start the trial in April. So it creates a complication.

But I think that my sense is that all of the defendants can be ready to go to trial. The defendant with the greatest difficulty will be Mr. Raniere because there are additional charges of significance against him in the second superseding indictment, but I have Mr. Agnifilo's clear declaration that he and his client will be ready to go to trial. And I also have Mr. Geragos, who is a recent addition to Ms. Bronfman's trial team, and he's ready to go to trial.

1.3

2.2.

		4868		
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
2		X		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	: 18-CR-00204(NGG)		
4	Plaintiff ,	:		
5	-against-	United States Courthouse : Brooklyn, New York		
6	KEITH RANIERE, et al.,	:		
7	Defendant.	June 13, 2019, Thursday : 9:30 a.m.		
8		Χ		
9				
10				
11	APPEARANCES:			
12	For the Government:	RICHARD P. DONOGHUE		
13		United States Attorney BY: MOIRA K. PENZA, ESQ.		
14		TANYA HAJJAR, ESQ. MARK LESKO, ESQ.		
15		Assistant United States Attorneys 271 Cadman Plaza East		
16		Brooklyn, New York 11201		
17	For the Defendant:	BRAFMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 767 Third Avenue		
18		New York, New York 10017 BY: MARC A. AGNIFILO, ESQ.		
19		TENY ROSE GERAGOS, ESQ.		
20		DEROHANNESIAN & DEROHANNESIAN		
21		677 Broadway Albany, New York 12207		
22		BY: PAUL DerOHANNESIAN, II, ESQ. DANIELLE R. SMITH, ESQ.		
23		DWD ODD DDD OOD		
24	Court Reporter: Stacy A. Mace, RMR, CRR, RPR, CCR Official Court Reporter			
25	E-mail: S Proceedings recorded by comproduced by Computer-aided			

## Booth - cross - der Ohannesian 4934 Yes. 1 Α 2 For example? 3 Well, from moving computers across from one computer to 4 another, if you've got a file system that is a very, what we 5 call a young file system, like something we use with floppy disks, they don't actually hold on to all that data because 6 7 newer file systems can hold modified data, access data, much 8 differently. 9 So sometimes when you move the files across, a 10 creation date would be made, but a last access date wouldn't be created completely. You'd only have a date. So in some 11 ways you can actually modify dates and times as you move 12 13 across different file systems. 14 And that's not something you're able to determine without examining the computers along the way? 15 16 Not unless we have them in our hand, no. So, for example, in this case, we know there was a Dell 17 18 Dimension computer? 19 Α I don't know that, but if you're telling me. 20 Q Your analysis reflected a path that said Dell Dimension? 21 Α Yes, I do. 22 Q And you said there were two other computers? 23 Α Two other file paths that indicated other computers. 24 Q Like an Apple? 25 Like an Apple computer, yes.

EXHIBIT-B012

		Booth - cross - der Ohannesian	4935
1	Q	What was the third?	
2	Α	It was another Dell computer.	
3	Q	And then you mentioned last access date?	
4	Α	Yes, I did.	
5	Q	And last access date can have many meanings also;	
6	correct?		
7	Α	Yes.	
8	Q	It can mean literally the last time someone accessed	it;
9	correct?		
10	Α	Correct.	
11	Q	And it can also mean the last time it was copied?	
12	Α	A last access date can be moved across one computer t	0
13	another, but the access date, if they're like devices, would		1d
14	stay. So unless you've actually opened up an item and looked		
15	at it, it wouldn't change the last access date.		
16	Q	So last access doesn't even mean last view?	
17	Α	In some cases, software will change the last access d	ate
18	if you've opened it up. But it's really software dependant.		t.
19	Q	So last access date does not necessarily mean last	
20	viewed?		
21	Α	Correct.	
22	Q	But if a file is viewed, it would be reflected in an	
23	acce	ss date?	
24	Α	If it's opened up?	
25	Q	Yes.	

		Booth - cross - der Ohannesian	4936
1	A Depend	ing on what piece of software.	
2	Q And in	terms of file folders, files can be moved from	one
3	folder to a	nother; correct?	
4	A Yes.		
5	Q And yo	u don't have that information when you examine	а
6	hard drive	such as this, whether files were moved or not?	
7	A Well,	between devices, I do not.	
8	Q Or eve	n when it was on a Dell Dimension, Dell compute	er or
9	Apple computer?		
10	A No, I	do not.	
11	Q Does D	OS script also impact the file names?	
12	A Does w	hat? Excuse me?	
13	Q DOS.	D-O-S script?	
14	A I don'	t know what you're referring to.	
15	Q Your e	xaminations were at different times; correct?	
16	A As far	as my two examinations here were at two differ	ent
17	times, yes.		
18	Q With r	espect to the images that you testified about t	his
19	morning, Government Exhibits 518, A through U, they're also		0
20	reflected in your report.		
21	Y	ou understand my question?	
22	A As far	as looking at the actual items themselves?	
23	Q Let me	try to break it down then.	
24	S	o Government Exhibit 518-A through U are like	
25	images, pri	nted images?	

	Booth - cross - der Ohannesian 4937	
1	A Okay, yes.	
2	Q In addition, you have a report that talks about those	
3	images and the data for those images; correct?	
4	A Yes.	
5	Q And some of those were reviewed with you on direct	
6	examination by the prosecutor; correct?	
7	A Correct.	
8	Q Do you know, without looking at your report, what the	
9	file creation date is for each and every one of Government	
10	Exhibit 518-A through U?	
11	A No, I'd have to see the report itself.	
12	Q Then we can do that.	
13	MR. der OHANNESIAN: This is Government	
14	Exhibit 504-A. I'm going to put it on the screen.	
15	(Exhibit published.)	
16	Q Starting with first of all, can you read it?	
17	A The highlighted item?	
18	Q Yes, .jpg 150?	
19	A Yes, I can.	
20	Would you like me to read it out loud?	
21	Q Does that help you recall the file creation date for .jpg	
22	150?	
23	A Yes, it does.	
24	Q July 26th, 2003?	
25	A Correct.	

		Booth - cross - der Ohannesian 4938
1	Q	151, file creation date.
2	Α	Correct.
3	Q	Same?
4	Α	2003.
5	Q	.jpg 152?
6	Α	Correct.
7	Q	July 2003.
8		.jpg 153, July 2003?
9	Α	Correct.
10	Q	.jpg 154, creation date of July 2003?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	.jpg 155, creation date of July 26th, 2003?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	.jpg 156, creation date of July 2003?
15	Α	Correct.
16	Q	.jpg 160, a creation date of July 26th, 2003?
17	Α	Correct.
18	Q	.jpg 161, creation date of July 26th, 2003?
19	Α	Correct.
20	Q	.jpg 162, creation date of July 26th, 2003?
21	Α	Correct.
22	Q	And .jpg 163, a creation date of July 26th, 2003?
23	Α	Correct.
24	Q	So with respect to .jpg images 150 to 163, they were all
25	crea	ted, according to your forensic examination, on July 26th,

EXHIBIT-B016 VB OCR CRR

## Booth - cross - der Ohannesian 4939 1 2003; correct? 2 Yes. Α 3 And in terms of the times, going back, we'll go 4 backwards. That date, 2:05:16, 2:05:16, 2:05:15, 2:05:15, 2:05:14, 2:05:14, 2:05:14, 2:05:13, 2:05:13? 5 Α Correct. 6 7 Q 2:05:12, 2:05:12, 2:05:12, and 2:05:11. 8 So on those, the first set of .jpg images, there was 9 a creation date of July 26th, 2013? 10 Α Correct. 11 Now, with respect to .jpgs 184 to 191, which you talked 12 about this morning and yesterday, which were also contained in 13 Exhibit 518, do you know what the file creation date was for 14 those messages? I recall, I thought they were 2003, also. 15 Α 16 Q Would you know for sure if you looked at --17 Α The report would show it. 18 Q The one we were just looking at? 19 Α Yes. 20 So this is Exhibit 504-A. This is the second set of 21 images that you testified about with the prosecution. .jpg 22 184 creation date, July 26th, 2003, 2:05 p.m.? 23 185, July 26th, 2003? 24 Α Correct. 25 Q 205.

	Booth - cross - der Ohannesian 4940	
1	.jpg 186, creation date, July 26th, 2003, 2:05 p.m.	
2	.jpg 187, file creation, July 26th, 2003, 2:05 p.m.	
3	.jpg 188, file creation, July 26th, 2003, 2:05 p.m.	
4	.jpg 189, July 26th, 2003, 2:05 p.m.	
5	.jpg 190, July 26th, 2003, 2:05 p.m.	
6	And the last in this series from 184 to 191, file	
7	creation date of July 26th, 2003, at 2:05 p.m.?	
8	A Correct.	
9	Q So looking at that, it's fair to say that for images 184	
10	to 191, they have the same file creation date as .jpg images	
11	150 to 163.	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q And in your opinion, is the metadata that was generated	
14	with respect to file creation reliable?	
15	A No.	
16	Q Is it possible these images were created in 2004?	
17	A Yes.	
18	Q Is it possible they were created in 2005?	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q Is it possible they were created in 2006?	
21	A You can keep going on what dates. I don't know.	
22	Q Right. It could be 2008?	
23	A Yes.	
24	Q It could be 2010?	
25	A Correct.	

	Booth - cross - der Ohannesian 4941
1	Q Because the file creation metadata is not reliable in
2	this case, according to you; correct?
3	A The file the file system metadata for those dates and
4	times are not accurate.
5	Q That issue has nothing to do with how you may have
6	conducted your examination; is that correct?
7	A Correct.
8	Q And these images which form the basis of the photographs
9	which were displayed today, also had modified dates on them?
10	A Yes, they did.
11	Q And do you remember what the modified date was for .jpg
12	images 150 to 163?
13	A If I recall, it came back to a 2005 date.
14	Q Okay. And with respect to .jpg images 184 and 195, do
15	you recall what the file modified date was?
16	A I think they call came back to 2005.
17	Q And then did you determine in your analysis file access
18	dates?
19	A No, I did not.
20	
21	(Continued on following page.)
22	
23	
24	
25	

		Proceedings 4973
1	Α	Which which metadata are you specifically
2	Q	The date accessed.
3	Α	You're talking from the file system?
4	Q	I'm talking about the data that we just looked at.
5	Α	That file system data appears to have been changed.
6	Q	When we say "changed," it was changed while it was in the
7	poss	ession of the FBI?
8	Α	If I'm taking the dates on when we received it, it would
9	appear so.	
10	Q	And the dates that you received just now came from your
11	repo	rt, correct?
12	Α	Yes.
13	Q	That you generated as evidence in the case against
14	Unit	ed States against Keith Raniere, correct?
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	The goal of forensic examination is to preserve the
17	elec	tronic data, so that the metadata doesn't change, correct?
18	Α	Correct.
19	Q	Do you know the name of the person who accessed the SD or
20	medi	a card, Exhibit 524, on September 19, 2018?
21	Α	No, I do not.
22	Q	Do you have any record in any piece of evidence or notes
23	that	reflects the accessing of Government Exhibit 524 by any
24	repr	esentative of the FBI on September 19, 2018?
25	Α	No, I do not.

 ${\small \mathsf{EXHIBIT}\text{-}\mathsf{B}020} \qquad \qquad \mathsf{SAM} \qquad \mathsf{OCR} \qquad \mathsf{RMR} \qquad \mathsf{CRR} \qquad \mathsf{RPR}$ 

## Proceedings 4974 1 Q Based on your forensic examination of the Western Digital 2 drive, or Government Exhibit 524, do you have any digital 3 evidence that Keith Raniere knew the content of any of the 4 electronic images on either Government Exhibit 503 or 524? I don't know Mr. Raniere, so I would never know what he 5 knows. 6 7 Do you have any -- based on your forensic examination, do Q 8 you have any digital evidence as to the identity of any 9 individual who at any time may have accessed any information 10 on the Western Digital hard drive? I do not know. 11 Based on your forensic examination, do you have any 12 13 digital evidence of the identity of any individual who may 14 have accessed any electronic information on Government Exhibit 524? 15 16 I don't know who had access to this. 17 And based on your forensic examination of Government 18 Exhibit 503 or 504, do you know the identity of any person who 19 took any particular image about which you have testified 20 before this grand jury -- before this jury? 21 I just know people's pictures that are in the images, 22 that's it. 23 Q You don't know the identity of any person who would have 24 been behind the camera at any particular time --25 Α No.

```
Proceedings
                                                                  4975
          -- fair to say?
 1
    Q
 2
    Α
          Fair.
 3
               MR. der OHANNESIAN: Nothing else, Your Honor.
    Thank you.
 4
 5
               (Continued on the following page.)
 6
7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

EXHIBIT-B022 SAM OCR RMR CRR RPR